

1 JEROME C. ROTH (SBN 159483)  
2 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
3 560 Mission Street  
Twenty-Seventh Floor  
4 San Francisco, CA 94105-2907  
Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077  
5 *jerome.roth@mto.com*

6 Attorney for Defendant  
LG.PHILIPS LCD AMERICA, INC.

7  
8  
9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 Michael Eliav, individually and on behalf of all  
13 those similarly situated,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 LG Philips LCD Co. Ltd., LG Philips LCD  
17 America, Inc.; Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.;  
Sharp Corporation; Sharp Electronics  
18 Corporation; Toshiba Corporation; Toshiba  
Matsushita Display Technology Co., Ltd.;  
Hitachi Ltd.; Hitachi Displays, Ltd.; Hitachi  
19 America Ltd.; Hitachi Electronic Devices  
(USA), Inc.; Sanyo Epson Imaging Devices  
Corporation; NEC Corporation; NEC Display  
20 Solutions of America, Inc.; NEC LCD  
Technologies, Ltd.; NEC Electronics America,  
21 Inc.; IDT International Ltd.; AU Optronics;  
International Display Technology Co., Ltd.;  
International Display Technology USA Inc.;  
22 AU Optronics Corporation America; Chi Mei  
Optoelectronics; Chi Mei Optoelectronics  
USA, Inc.; Chunghwa Picture Tubes Ltd.;  
23 Hannstar Display Corporation;

24 Defendants.

25 CASE NO. C 06-07931 (MMC)

26 **STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF  
TIME**

27 Honorable Maxine M. Chesney

1                   WHEREAS plaintiff filed a complaint in the above-captioned case on or about  
2 December 28, 2006;

3                   WHEREAS plaintiff alleges antitrust violations by manufacturers of Liquid  
4 Crystal Display (“LCD”) products;

5                   WHEREAS more than thirty-six complaints have been filed to date in federal  
6 district courts throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bringing class actions on  
7 behalf of indirect purchasers alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers of LCD products  
8 (collectively, “the LCD Cases”);

9                   WHEREAS there is a motion pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict  
10 Litigation to transfer the LCD Cases to the Northern District of California for coordinated or  
11 consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407;

12                   WHEREAS plaintiff anticipates the possibility of Consolidated Amended  
13 Complaints in the LCD Cases;

14                   WHEREAS plaintiff and LG.Philips LCD America, Inc. (“LPL America”) have  
15 agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the LCD Cases would be  
16 more efficient for the parties and for the Court;

17                   WHEREAS plaintiff agrees that the deadline for LPL America to respond to the  
18 Complaint shall be extended until the earlier of the following two dates: (1) forty-five days after  
19 the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after  
20 plaintiff provides written notice to LPL America that he does not intend to file a Consolidated  
21 Amended Complaint, provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case  
22 management conference in the MDL transferee court in this case;

23                   WHEREAS plaintiff further agrees that this extension is available, without further  
24 stipulation with counsel for plaintiff, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of  
25 their intention to join this extension;

26                   WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by LPL America or any  
27 defendant of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal or subject  
28

1 matter jurisdiction, insufficiency of process, insufficiency of service of process, or improper  
2 venue.

3 PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT LPL AMERICA, BY AND THROUGH THEIR  
4 RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

5 1. The deadline for LPL America to respond to the Complaint shall be  
6 extended until the earlier of the following two dates (1) forty-five days after the filing of a  
7 Consolidated Amended Complaint in the LCD Cases; or (2) forty-five days after the plaintiff  
8 provides written notice that he does not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint,  
9 provided that such notice may be given only after the initial case management conference in the  
10 MDL transferee court in this case.

11 2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for  
12 plaintiff or further order of the Court, to all named defendants who notify plaintiff in writing of  
13 their intention to join this extension.

14 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

15 DATED: January 29, 2007

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

18  
19 By: /s/ Jerome C. Roth  
20 JEROME C. ROTH  
21 Attorney for Defendant  
22 LG.PHILIPS LCD AMERICA, INC.

23 Of Counsel:

24 Michael R. Lazerwitz  
25 Jeremy J. Calsyn  
26 Lee F. Berger  
27 CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN &  
28 HAMILTON LLP  
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 974-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 974-1999

1 DATED: January 24, 2007

GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP

2  
3 By: Susan Kupfer  
4 SUSAN KUPFER

5 Attorney for Plaintiff  
6 MICHAEL ELIAV

7  
8  
9 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO  
10 ORDERED:

11 Dated: January 30, 2007

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Maxine M. Chesney  
Honorable Maxine M. Chesney  
Judge of the United States District Court

STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION  
OF TIME CASE NO. CV 06-07931 (MMC)